

Amendments to the Drawings:

Please replace the drawing filed with the application with the attached Amended Replacement Drawing Sheet.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

As a result of the forgoing amendment, the specification has been amended to avoid the objections thereto noted by the Examiner in paragraph 12 on page 5 of the Office Action. In addition, the Abstract of the Disclosure has been amended to avoid the objection raised by the Examiner on page 11 of the Office Action.

Submitted herewith is an Amended Replacement Drawing Sheet which has been amended to address the objection set forth in paragraph 13 on page 5 of the Office Action. It is noted in this regard that Line A-A is shown in Fig. 9 and not Fig. 8.

Accordingly, all of these objections to the specification and the drawings have been obviated and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner's indication of the allowance of Claims 9, 11 and 13-16 are appreciatively acknowledged.

Claims 5-7 have been rewritten as new dependent Claims 18, 19 and 20, as has Claim 4. Accordingly, these claims are allowable. These independent claims are allowable as noted because they conform to the Examiner's requirement in paragraph 9 on page 4. Similarly, Claim 4 is now allowable since it has been rewritten as new Claim 17. The rejection of Claims 10 and 12 are improper since they are each dependent on a claim which the Examiner has indicated is allowable, i.e. Claim 10 is dependent from Claim 9 and Claim 12 is dependent from Claim 11, each of the latter having been deemed allowable as set forth in paragraph 8 on page 4 of the Office Action. Accordingly, indication of the allowance of these claims is requested.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1, 2 and 8, as amended, as being anticipated by Hitchcock '620 are respectfully requested.

It appears to be the Examiner's position that numeral 8 depicted in Hitchcock can be considered as the "handle" as recited in Claim 8. However, a reading of the present specification indicates that the ring attached to the cable shown in the Hitchcock reference is different from the handle (48) depicted, for example, Figs. 1 and 2 of the present application. Thus, handle (48) is intended to be gripped by a worker, but not through any cable. In addition, it appears that handle(s) (48) is intended to be gripped directly by the worker and pulled downwardly, i.e., both handles are to be gripped and pulled downwardly which is different from the invention of Hitchcock.

More specifically, ring cap G shown in Hitchcock is intended to move bar D to trip member cap E and permit the rings h to be released therefrom when it is desired to dump the load carried by the sling. This is in contrast to handle (48) of the present claims which is to be gripped directly by the worker and pulled downwardly. The cord g attached to ring cap G in Hitchcock corresponds to an operating rope (46) of Figs. 1-7. Thus, there is nothing equivalent in Hitchcock to handle 48 of the present invention. This rejection is untenable and should be withdrawn.


Turning to the rejection of Claim 3 as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hitchcock in view of Hogan '931, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are also requested. The Examiner asserts that Hogan '931 shows a dismounting device which assertedly is similar to that of Hitchcock. However, the Examiner admits that the Hogan release means comprises a slider (39), locking means (58), and unlocking means (50, 54). It is noted that Claim 8 is not included in this rejection and since Claim 1 has been amended by including the recitation of Claim 8, this rejection also fails and should be withdrawn.

Finally, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-3 as being obvious over the combination of Lawton '445 taken with Hitchcock, this rejection should be

withdrawn. Lawton '445 as conceded by the Examiner, does not show a sling having one end attached to the base and the other end attached to the link lever. The Examiner relies on Hitchcock for this discrepancy. However, Lawton also does not indicate where a releasing hook could be placed on the Lawton device as closed. Consequently, the combination of these references neither discloses nor remotely suggests the device as now recited in Claims 1-3. This rejection should also be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration and prompt Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,


Jules Goldberg Reg. No. 24,408
Attorney for Applicants
Customer No. 42109
DUANE MORRIS LLP
1540 Broadway
New York, New York 10036-4086
(212) 692-1000

Date: December 9, 2008